

REMARKS

Interview with Examiner:

Applicant expresses appreciation to the Examiner for the courtesy of the telephonic interview on January 10, 2006. The following individuals participated in the interview: (i) Examiner Queler; (ii) David Blumenthal, Attorney for Applicant; and (iii) Justin Sobaje, Attorney for Applicant.

The Examiner was asked to clarify the interrogatory presented in the requirement for information, which states, "Was this invention disclosed or used prior to the filing date of the Application?"

In response, the Examiner clarified the interrogatory, and stated that the interrogatory should actually be: Was this invention publicly disclosed anywhere or publicly used in the United States prior to the filing date of the United States application?

No exhibits were shown and no demonstrations were conducted during the interview. No prior art references were discussed and no arguments were made with respect to the claims during the interview.

Responses to Requirements for Information:

In the present Office Action, the Examiner asked for the names of any products or services that have incorporated the claimed subject matter.

In response to the Examiner's requirement, there are no products and no services that have incorporated the claimed subject matter.

The interrogatory presented in the present Office Action and as clarified by the Examiner in the interview of January 10, 2006, asks, "Was this invention publicly disclosed anywhere or publicly used in the United States prior to the filing date of the United States application?"

In response to the interrogatory, this invention was not publicly disclosed anywhere and was not publicly used in the United States prior to the filing date of the United States application.

Submitted concurrently with this reply is an IDS listing the document JP 8-348586. The document JP 8-348586 is a foreign application related to the present application. JP 8-348586 is not prior art with respect to the present application, because JP 8-348586 was published on July 21, 1998, which is not more than one year prior to the filing date of July 21, 1999, of the present application.

Conclusion:

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date March 21, 2006

By Justin M. Sobaje

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (310) 975-7965
Facsimile: (310) 557-8475

Justin M. Sobaje
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 56,252